ACTIVE CASES
Analysis January 2005 QA Results for Food Stamps

Sample Size: 92
     (drops excluded)

Totals for January 2005:

LOCATION	TOTAL SAMPLE ISSUANCE	# of ERROR CASES	ERROR DOLLAR TOTAL	PERCENT DOLLARS IN ERROR	FFY 2005 ERROR RATE
STATEWIDE	$17,885.00	12	$ 929.00	5.19%	5.0%
MILWAUKEE	7,152.00	7	449.00	6.27 %	6.0 %
BAL- STATE	10,728.00	5	654.00	4.47%	4.2%

ERROR CAUSES BY TYPE

10- Agency Preventable Errors
 1- Client Error
 1- State Error

OVERVIEW OF THE ERRORS AND WHERE THEY OCCURRED:
Of the 10 Agency Preventable Errors, 5 were in Milwaukee, and the other 5 were in five
counties: Douglas, Juneau, Rock, Winnebago and Washington. The one client error
was in Milwaukee.

 TYPES OF A.P.E. ERRORS (10):

Regular Earned Income (3):
     Budgeted earnings on job that was know to have ended (2)
     Failed to act on reported change in income (non-SMRF) (1)

Unearned Income(1):
     Failed to budget Unemployment Comp. Benefits-matches were received
     Failure to budget Veterans benefits, known to agency.

Utilities (2):
     Failed to require verification of utilities at a reported move.
     Failed to budget correct utilities-lease shows heat included but agency budgeted

Household Composition (1):
      Failed to remove person from household after it was reported

FSET (1):
      VQT sanction imposed on an exempt individual

Supplement (1):
      Failed to generate supplement timely after change reported that increased benefits
CS Expense (1) :
     Failed to budget a Child Support expense that showed on the pay stubs submitted.

A DIFFERENT VIEW:

5 of the above 10 A.P.E.'s were failure to act on known information
4 of the A.P.E.s were failure to correctly interpret the verification given when budgeting
1 of the A.P.E.'s was incorrect interpretation of policy

The ten reasons listed in the two sections above are only the primary error in each case. Several cases have multiple errors made in them.

TYPE OF CLIENT ERRORS (1):

Rent Expense: Client failed to report at application that she received rent assistance. She only reported her gross rent. This could possibly be avoided by better interviewing. Did the Eligibility Worker just ask for a lease? Did they just say" how much is your rent? " Even if they get a lease or an answer, they should emphasize question about others assisting with the rent (on ANHQ). On the CWW it would be useful to have the shelter screen ask about rent assistance.

TYPE OF STATE ERROR (1):

A child had been receiving RSDI under her father's claim number. That ended in October 2004. No matches were received subsequent to that showing that the child was now receiving RSDI under her mother's claim number.

WHEN WERE THE AGENCY PREVENTABLE ERRORS MADE?

Two of the errors were made at application, three made at reported change.

WHEN WERE THE CLIENT ERRORS MADE?

Three client errors were at reviews; two were at time of the change (for non-reduced reporting households).

EFFECT OF SMRF PROCESS: One error case in Milwaukee was SMRF-related. The worker made case comments that the SMRF was received and entries updated. However, they made no updates and then they ran/confirmed benefits. Consequently the wages and child support amounts budgeted were incorrect.

TRENDS OR RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Milwaukee County's sample was 40.22% of the total dollars sampled. The balance of the state had 59.78% of the total dollars sampled.

- The sample size was large-- 92 completed cases.

- Failure to act on reported changes is a big concern. Caseload sizes and worker shortages exacerbate this problem. Change centers are being created to counter this problem, but specialization of work tasks may cause bigger caseloads for others. Also, task-related actions rather than having a grasp of the entire case activity may be problematic.
-
BIGGEST CONTRIBUTORS": The cases that caused the largest dollar errors for January 2005 (including client errors):

Douglas County, $176 Agency Preventable Error: The agency sanctioned a recipient for a job "Voluntary Quit," but the person was exempt from FSET as a caretaker of a child under age 6.   Also the begin month of an average for self-employment was incorrect.

Milwaukee County, $166 Agency Preventable Error: At review the agency budgeted earned income. There was nothing in the case file in case comments or on AFWG to show how the income was verified and budgeted. QC verified the person had ended the job well before the review.   The agency also failed to budget the correct utility expense. The amount of the error was reduced somewhat because the client also failed to report money regularly given to the household by an individual who did not consider it a loan to be repaid.

Washington County, $109 Agency Preventable Error: The customer reported a reduction in income which resulted in an increase in FS benefits. The agency failed to issue a supplement for the next month (the QC sample month) as instructed in Wisconsin FS Handbook Appendix 8.3.12.

mbw
5/26/05